



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/653,360	08/31/2000	Ichiro Nakano	1046.1221/JDH	4207

21171 7590 03/26/2003

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
700 11TH STREET, NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KEVIN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2674

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/653,360

Applicant(s)

NAKANO ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin M. Nguyen

Art Unit

2674

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsui (US 6,215,479).

As per claims 9 and 13, Matsui teaches touch screen pointing device 12, a detection unit 14, a display control unit 15 displaying a cursor on an image screen 18 indicated by the coordinate input unit 12 (see figures 2 and 4, column 8, lines 26-65, column 10, line 63 through column 11, line 54).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8, 10-12 and 14-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsui (US 6,215,479) in view of Yano et al (US 5,539,429).

As per claims 1, 5, 15, 16 and 17, Matsui teaches an operation screen unit 18, a first control circuit 15 (see figure 2, column 8, lines 22-65). Matsui teach all of the claimed limitation, except for "an operation mode selecting unit... a first operation mode with first function...a second operation mode with second function of displaying a marker..." Yano et al teach a touch panel device having a an operation mode selecting unit SW1-SW8, a first operation mode (SW1) with a first function (11), a second operation mode (SW2) with a second function (12) of displaying a marker M (xo, yo) (see figure 1, 3e, column 3, lines 8-18, column 4, lines 40-47). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize an operation mode selecting unit taught by Yano et al in Matsui's touch input device because this would provide the displayed information alone on the screen, enabling the operator to watch the entire information with is otherwise concealed partially by the switch pattern (column 7, lines 15-18 of Yano et al)

As per claims 2-4, 6, 7, 14, Matsui teaches a connecting module 19 (see figure 2, column 10, lines 55-59), at least one of a touch position (X1, Y1) on image screen 18 based on the touch by the finger position (X1, Y1) of image screen 12 (see figure 4A and 4B).

As per claim 8, Matsui teaches a second control unit 19 (see figure 2).

As per claim 10, Yano et al teach a process function key, touch switch input on the second operation mode (see figures 1, 4 and 5).

As per claims 11, 12, Yano et al teach erase key pattern after n sec elapsed (see figure 9).

As per claims 18-25, Yano et al teach inherently a storage medium readable by a machine, tangible embodying a program of instructions providing by a CPU 7.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Kevin M. Nguyen** whose telephone number is **703-305-6209**. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-THU from 9:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard A Hjerpe** can be reached on **703-305-4709**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered response should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Application/Control Number: 09/653,360

Page 5

Art Unit: 2674

Kevin M. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2674

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Hjerpe', is positioned above the printed name.

RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600